

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

HET MCPS, LLC, *et al.*,

*

Plaintiffs,

*

v.

*

Civil Action No. RDB-24-3366

AUTOFLEX, INC., *et al.*,

*

Defendants.

*

* * * * *

MEMORANDUM ORDER

The instant case was filed on November 21, 2024. (ECF No. 1.) Through their Complaint, Plaintiffs HET MCPS, LLC, HEF-P Baltimore City, LLC, and HEF-P Manassas, LLC (collectively, “Highland” or “Plaintiffs”) allege that Defendants Autoflex, Inc. and its president and owner Luis MacDonald (collectively, “Defendants”) tortiously interfered with Plaintiffs’ contractual relations (Counts One, Three, and Four) and prospective economic advantage (Count Two), engaged in unfair competition (Count Five), and published injurious falsehoods (Count Six); and further request declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202 (Count Seven).

The docket reflects that service was effectuated on Autoflex on December 13, 2024, making its answer due January 3, 2025 (ECF No. 16), and service was effectuated on MacDonald on December 23, 2024, making his answer due January 13, 2025 (ECF No. 17). On January 14, 2025, Highland filed a Request for Entry of Default Against Defendants (ECF No. 17), which remains pending on this Court’s docket. That request is now moot, as the Defendants filed Answers (ECF Nos. 20, 21) on January 24, 2025. Accordingly, the pending

Request for Entry of Default Against Defendants (ECF No. 17) is now moot.

On January 27, 2025, this Court entered a Scheduling Order (ECF No. 24), which, among other things, directed the parties to file on or before February 10, 2025 (1) requests for modification of the initial scheduling order; (2) joint requests for early settlement/ADR conference; (3) report about deposition hours; and (4) initial report about whether there is unanimous consent to proceed before a United States Magistrate Judge. (*Id.* at 1–2.) And so, on February 10, 2025, Plaintiffs filed an “Initial Report and Opposed Request to Modify Initial Scheduling Order” (ECF No. 26), which indicated that Plaintiffs requested modification to the scheduling order, noting anticipation of “significant discovery from third parties” and that extending deadlines relating to experts would promote efficiency. (*Id.* at 1–3.) Having considered Plaintiffs’ request and Defendant’s opposition, and finding that good cause has not been shown to justify the extent of the extensions requested, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** this 13th day of February, 2025, that the Plaintiffs’ request is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**. Specifically, the scheduling order is **MODIFIED** as follows:

Event	Current Date (ECF No. 24)	Plaintiffs’ Requested Extension (ECF No. 26)	Revised Date
Moving for joinder of additional parties and amendment of pleadings	March 13, 2025	April 4, 2025	April 4, 2025
Plaintiffs’ Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures	March 28, 2025	October 24, 2025	June 27, 2025
Defendants’ Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures	April 28, 2025	November 21, 2025	July 25, 2025
Plaintiffs’ rebuttal Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures	May 12, 2025	December 19, 2025	August 22, 2025
Rule 26(e)(2) supplementation of disclosures and responses	May 19, 2025	January 16, 2026	August 29, 2025
Discovery deadline;	June 11, 2025	February 20, 2026	September 26, 2025

submission of status report			
Requests for admission	June 18, 2025	February 27, 2026	October 10, 2025
Dispositive pretrial motions deadline	July 11, 2025	April 3, 2026	October 24, 2025
Oppositions to dispositive pretrial motions deadline	Not provided in Order	May 1, 2026	November 7, 2025
Replies in support of dispositive pretrial motions deadline	Not provided in Order	May 22, 2026	November 21, 2025

It is further **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Request for Entry of Default Against Defendants (ECF No. 17) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

/s/

Richard D. Bennett
United States Senior District Judge